



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/690,212	10/17/2000	Malik Mamdani	IMPULSITY03	2168

7590 08/12/2005
THOMAS F. BERGER, ESQUIRE
WILLIAM MULLEN
8270 GREENSBORO DRIVE
SUITE 700
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

ABDI, KAMBIZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/690,212

Applicant(s)

MAMDANI ET AL.

Examiner

Kambiz Abdi

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,13-42,44-48 and 52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,13-42,44-48 and 52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3 May 2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

1. The prior office actions are incorporated herein by reference. In particular, the observations with respect to claim language, and response to previously presented arguments.

- Claims 1, 13, 28, 31, 34, and 44-47 have been amended.
- Claims 11, 12, 43, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, and 55 are canceled.
- Claims 1-10, 13-42, 44-48, and 52 have been considered.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1, 34, 52 are objected to because of the following informalities: claims 1 and 34 recite the “**determining whether** said requested transaction for said commercial item can be fulfilled” (emphasis added). The phrase “determining whether... can be fulfilled” makes the claims conditional; therefore the claims are not clearly distinguishable. Also the phrase “can be...” and “capable of...” are directed to an intended use and should be clarified. Appropriate correction is requested.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 3 May 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as well as they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection in light of the amended claims by the applicant.

4. As to the applicability of Ferber reference (publication number US 2002/0004746 A1) to the extent of the provisional application is concerned the examiner has reviewed the provisional application number 60/198,092 and the provisional application contains and supports all the subject matters that has been relied on in the Ferber reference publication number US 2002/0004746 A1. Therefore, the Ferber publication number US 2002/0004746 A1 qualifies as the priority date of 17 April 2000.

5. As arguments put forward by the applicant in regards to claims 14-19, 22-33 and 52 in regards to the limitation “optically scanning the *second* transaction code from a visual display of the wireless communication device” (emphasis added), it is only a mere duplication of the same limitation steps recited in the claim as for the first code “optically scanning the *first* transaction code from a visual display of the

Art Unit: 3621

wireless communication device" (emphasis added). The step recites a second code is scanned that is identical to scanning of the first code. As well as, communication of such second transaction code does not differ from the first transaction code in any particular way (See applicant's figures 3A-3B). The codes might be different, however, just the difference in codes does not specifically changes the device or the way it scans the code and transmits such information over a communication link.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5, 13, 15, 22-26, 34, 38-42, 44-48, and 52 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0004746 to John B. Ferber in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,809 to Brett Nakfoor.

8. As per claims 1, 5, and 34, Ferber discloses a method for facilitating a wireless transaction, comprising:

- receiving, by a transaction management system, a transaction request from a transaction requester for a commercial item, said item not in the form of a coupon (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0028]-[0030]);
- determining whether said requested transaction for said commercial item can be fulfilled;
- upon determining that said requested transaction can be fulfilled, communicating a first transaction code to a wireless communication device (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], [0021], [0023], [0028]-[0030]);

Art Unit: 3621

- displaying the first transaction code on a visual display of the wireless communication device (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0009], [0025], [0030]);
- optically scanning the first transaction code from the visual display (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0009], [0025], [0030]); and
- receiving, by the transaction management system, a decoded representation of the first transaction code in response to optically scanning the first transaction code (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], [0021], [0023], [0028]-[0030]);

What is not explicitly disclosed by the Ferber reference is the use of other commercial items or transactions for items that are not specifically coupons as well as the fulfillment of such transaction can be made. However, the Nakfoor reference clearly discloses that transaction requester is requesting a transaction that is not for an item in a form of coupon (ticket to enter into a venue) (See Nakfoor column 3, lines 2-64, and column 5, lines 22-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to incorporate the teachings of the Nakfoor in teachings of Farber for improved and enhancement of delivery of items such as tickets to a user that has purchased them online and for presenting the ticket at the venue for entrance at the venue. As it is clearly thought by Nakfoor (See Nikfoor column 5, lines 38-40) and it is clearly thought that a bar code would be representing the transaction, which is presented at the venue for permission to enter. The use of Ferber teaching and Nikfoor teachings would alleviate the need or paper presentation a as well as electronically tracking the transaction for more speedy and accurate transaction.

9. As per claims 15, 22-26, and 52, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose a method for facilitating a wireless transaction, comprising:

- receiving, by a transaction management system, a transaction request from a transaction requester (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0028]-[0030]);
- communicating a first transaction code to a wireless communication device (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], [0021], [0023], [0028]-[0030]);

Art Unit: 3621

- displaying the first transaction code on a visual display of the wireless communication device (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0009], [0025], [0030]);
- optically scanning the first transaction code from the visual display (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0009], [0025], [0030]); and
- receiving, by the transaction management system, a decoded representation of the first transaction code in response to optically scanning the first transaction code (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], [0021], [0023], [0028]-[0030]);
- verifying an identity of the transaction requester (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], [0021], [0023], [0028]-[0030]).
- optically scanning the second transaction code from a visual display of the wireless communication device (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], [0021], [0023], [0028]-[0030]).

What Ferber fails to specifically and explicitly disclose communicating a second transaction code to the wireless communication device after receiving the first fulfillment verification. Examiner submits that forwarding or communicating a second verification message or transaction code in a transaction system would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants claimed invention. It also would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to communicate more than one message or transaction code in any transaction system since it has been held that mere duplication of essential working parts of a device or duplication of steps involves only routine skill in the art. See *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to modify the Ferber's teachings to send a second message for providing a better tracking of the transaction fulfillment in relation to keeping records of such transaction.

10. As per claims 19 and 27, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose all the limitations of claims 1 and 22, further;

Art Unit: 3621

Ferber is not explicit on verifying the transaction code in response to scanning the transaction code, however, examiner submits that one having ordinary skill in the art the at the time of applicant's invention would have recognized that this is a well known step when redeeming coupons. For example, at a minimum, an expiration date associated with the coupon code would have been verified.

11. As per claims 28-33 Ferber and Nakfoor disclose all the limitations of claim 27, further; What Ferber fails to specifically and explicitly disclose communicating a second transaction code to the wireless communication device after receiving the first fulfillment verification. Examiner submits that forwarding or communicating a second verification message or transaction code in a transaction system would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants claimed invention. It also would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to communicate more than one message or transaction code in any transaction system since it has been held that mere duplication of essential working parts of a device or duplication of steps involves only routine skill in the art. See *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8. Additionally Nakfoor does teach the step of sending a second message that if the ticket is invalid or valid and display such message (See Nakfoor column 5, lines 30-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to modify the Ferber's teachings to send a second message for providing a better tracking of the transaction fulfillment in relation to keeping records of such transaction and informing the participant of the validity of the transaction at the venue.

12. As per claims 2, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose the method of claim 1 wherein communicating the first transaction code includes communicating a first optically scannable transaction code (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], [0021], [0023], [0028]-[0030]).

Art Unit: 3621

13. As per claims 3, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose the method of claim 2 wherein communicating the optically scannable first transaction code includes communicating a first transaction barcode (See Ferber paragraphs [0009] and [0025]).

14. As per claims 4, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose the method of claim 1 wherein communicating the first transaction code includes communicating the first transaction code from the transaction management system (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], [0021], [0023], [0028]-[0030]).

15. As per claims 13, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose all the limitations of claim 1, further; Ferber discloses receiving, by the transaction management system, a first fulfillment verification after optically scanning the first transaction code (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, [0009], [0025], [0030]).

16. As per claims 38, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose the system of claim 34, wherein the transaction management system is coupled to a telecommunication network system for enabling communication with the wireless communication device (See Ferber figure 1).

17. As per claims 39, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose the system of claim 38, wherein the transaction management system is coupled to the telecommunication network through a computer network system (See Ferber figure 1 and paragraphs [0021], [0022]).

18. As per claims 40, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose the system of claim 34, wherein the transaction management system is coupled to a wireless data network system for enabling communication with the wireless communication device (See Ferber figure 1 and paragraphs [0021], [0022]).

Art Unit: 3621

19. As per claims 41, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose the system of claim 40, wherein the transaction management system is coupled to the wireless data network system through a computer network system (See Ferber figure 1 and paragraphs [0021], [0022]).

20. As per claims 42, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose the system of claim 41, wherein the wireless data network system includes a wireless local area network system (See Ferber figure 1 and [0021], [0022]).

21. As per claims 44, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose the system of claim 34 wherein the transaction fulfillment system includes a code-scanning device (See Ferber paragraphs [0009], [0025]).

22. As per claims 45, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose the system of claim 44 wherein the code-scanning device includes a bar code reader (See Ferber paragraphs [0009], [0025]).

23. As per claims 46, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose the system of claim 34 wherein the transaction fulfillment system is capable of decoding the transaction code in response to optically scanning the transaction code (See Ferber paragraphs [0025], [0030]).

24. As per claims 47-48, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose the system of claim 34 wherein the transaction fulfillment system and the wireless communication device each include a radio transceiver for enabling communication directly between the wireless communication device and the transaction fulfillment system (See Ferber figure 1 and paragraphs [0021], [0022]).

25. Claims 6-10, 14, 16-18, and 20-21, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0004746 to John B. Ferber in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,809 to Brett Nakfoor as applied to claims 1, 5, and 34 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,590,038 to Satyan G. Pitroda.

Art Unit: 3621

26. As per claims 6-9 and 35-37, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose all the limitations of claims 1 and 34, further; Ferber does not explicitly disclose verifying the identity of the transaction requester includes authenticating a transaction requester through the use of a speech services module for audibly verifying the identity of the requester by comparing voiceprints. Examiner takes Official Notice that verifying the identity of transaction requester is notoriously well known in the business art. For example, Pitroda discloses an electronic transaction system and method for conducting electronic transactions and clearly discloses method for verification of the identity of a transaction requester by displaying signatures or other types of identifications such as photographs, fingerprints or voice prints (See Pitroda column 12, lines 54-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to modify the Ferber's teachings and verify the identity of the transaction requester for obvious reasons such as ensuring that the requester is actually the person they claims to be and are authorized to carry out the transaction.

27. As per claims 10, 14, 16-18, and 20-21, Ferber and Nakfoor disclose all the limitations of claim 6, further; Ferber discloses displaying the first transaction code on a visual display of the wireless communication device; and optically scanning the first transaction code from the visual display (See Ferber figures 1 and 4, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], [0021], [0023], [0028]-[0030]).

28. Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

Art Unit: 3621

Conclusion

29. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

30. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

31. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Kambiz Abdi** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-6702**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **James Trammell** can be reached at **(571) 272-6712**.

32. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

<http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231**

or faxed to:

Art Unit: 3621

(571) 273-8300 [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

(571) 273-6702 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Examiner in the

Knox Building, 50 Dulany St. Alexandria, VA.

Kambiz Abdi
Examiner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kambiz Abdi', written over the printed name and title.

August 8, 2005